

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 remain pending in the application, with claims 1, 16 and 25 being the independent claims. For all of the reasons set forth in the previous Response, Applicants continue to believe that a species election requirement is improper. In addition, the “species” that have been identified in the Office Action do not even include the drawings that pertain to the claimed methods.

However, because an election is mandatory, Applicants elect Species IV, as most closely corresponding to claims 16-32. All such claims are believed to read on the elected species, as the other identified species do not show any significant aspects of the claimed methods.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this paper that have not been accounted for in this paper or the accompanying papers, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-3735. If an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is required for the filing of this paper and is not accounted for in this paper or the accompanying papers, such an extension is requested and the fee (or any underpayment thereof) should also be charged to our Deposit Account. A duplicate copy of this page is enclosed for that purpose.

Dated: July 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,
MITCHELL, SILBERBERG & KNUPP LLP

MITCHELL, SILBERBERG & KNUPP LLP
11377 West Olympic Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90064
Telephone: (310) 312-2000
Facsimile: (310) 312-3100

By /Joseph G. Swan/
Joseph G. Swan
Registration No. 41,338